



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/904,665	07/16/2001	Ki-Hyub Sung	P56406	6179
7590	08/25/2004		EXAMINER	
Robert E. Bushnell Suite 300 1522 K Street, N.W. Washington, DC 20005			CHANG, YEAN HSI	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2835	

DATE MAILED: 08/25/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/904,665	SUNG, KI-HYUB	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Yean-Hsi Chang	2835	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 03 August 2004.
- 2a) This action is FINAL. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 3,5-10 and 15-32 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 3,5-7,10,15-17 and 20-32 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 8,9,18 and 19 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ .
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08) Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ .	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ .

DETAILED ACTION

The Examiner appreciates the Applicant's attorney for pointing out the errors in the office action mailed 6/3/2004. The finality of the case has been withdrawn; and that office action should be neglected. New rejections follow.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

1. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

2. Claims 5-6, 21, 24-25, 28-29 and 32 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(bg) as being anticipated by Nakamura et al. (US 5,768,095).

Nakamura teaches a display apparatus comprising: a panel (52, fig. 6) bearing a screen (inherent feature, not labeled) disposed to display varying visual images; a panel support (61, fig. 6) holding the panel; a bezel (53, fig. 6) framing a front periphery of the panel; a rear cover (51, fig. 4) removably mating with said bezel while encasing said panel held by said panel support; at least one rib (edge of 57b', better seen in fig. 10A) formed to extend from a peripheral surface of the bezel; at least one deformable coupling (57b, fig. 4) bearing a groove (shown in fig. 10A, not labeled), extending from an inner surface of the rear cover, oriented to embrace a correspond rib during said

mating (see fig. 10A) (claims 21, 25 and 29); at least one stop (shown next to lower edge of 61 in fig. 7A; not labeled) extending from an inner surface of said bezel engaging said support while maintaining said bezel surrounding said screen (claims 24, 28 and 32); at least a pair of stops (only the cross-sectional view of one side of 53 and 61 in fig. 6 is shown in fig. 7, similar view of the other side not shown) protruding from said rear surface of the bezel to engage the panel support and prevent the panel support from moving across a plane of the panel (claim 5); and/or at least four stops disposed to be adjacent to four corner portions (the sectional view in fig. 7 is taken adjacent to one portion of a corner of the bezel 53 in fig. 6; same view may be at four corner portions) of the rear surface, and protrude from said rear surface of the bezel to engage the panel support and prevent the panel support from moving across a plane of the panel (claim 6).

3. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

4. Claims 21-22, 25-26 and 29-30 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Lee et al. (US 6,587,166 B1).

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application.

Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) might be overcome either by a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not the invention "by another," or by an appropriate showing under 37 CFR 1.131.

Lee teaches a display apparatus comprising: a panel (300, fig. 1) bearing a screen (inherent feature, not labeled) disposed to display varying visual images; a panel support (400, fig. 1) holding the panel; a bezel (500, fig. 1) framing a front periphery of the panel; a rear cover (100, fig. 1) removably mating with said bezel while encasing said panel held by said panel support; at least one rib (edge of 450 considered as a rib, fig. 9) formed to extend from a peripheral surface of the rear cover; at least one deformable coupling (535, fig. 10) bearing a groove (shown in fig. 10, not labeled), extending from an inner surface of the bezel, oriented to embrace a correspond rib during said mating (see fig. 15) (claims 21, 25 and 29); and wherein said rib disposed at each corner portion of the rear cover (100 and 400 combined as a cover shown in fig. 15, and said rib being at a corner portion as shown in fig. 15), and a corresponding said coupling disposed at each corner portion of the bezel (as shown in fig. 10) (claims 22, 26, and 30).

5. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

6. Claims 22-23, 26-27 and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Nakamura et al.

Nakamura discloses the claimed invention except one rib and one coupling being disposed at each corner portion of the rear cover and the bezel, respectively; or at each corner of the bezel and rear cover, respectively.

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device with one rib and one coupling at each corner portion of the rear cover and the bezel, respectively, or at each corner portion of the bezel and the rear cover, respectively, since it has been held that mere duplication of the essential working parts of a device and rearranging parts of an invention involves only routine skill in the art. MPEP §2144.04 VI B & C.

7. Claims 6-7 and 15-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Nakamura et al. in view of Lee et al.

The applied reference has a common assignee with the instant application. Based upon the earlier effective U.S. filing date of the reference, it constitutes prior art only under 35 U.S.C. 102(e). This rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) might be overcome by: (1) a showing under 37 CFR 1.132 that any invention disclosed but not claimed in

the reference was derived from the inventor of this application and is thus not an invention "by another"; (2) a showing of a date of invention for the claimed subject matter of the application which corresponds to subject matter disclosed but not claimed in the reference, prior to the effective U.S. filing date of the reference under 37 CFR 1.131; or (3) an oath or declaration under 37 CFR 1.130 stating that the application and reference are currently owned by the same party and that the inventor named in the application is the prior inventor under 35 U.S.C. 104, together with a terminal disclaimer in accordance with 37 CFR 1.321(c). For applications filed on or after November 29, 1999, this rejection might also be overcome by showing that the subject matter of the reference and the claimed invention were, at the time the invention was made, owned by the same person or subject to an obligation of assignment to the same person. See MPEP § 706.02(I)(1) and § 706.02(I)(2).

Nakamura discloses the claimed invention except at least four stops disposed to be adjacent to four corner portions of the rear surface, and protrude from said rear surface of the bezel to engage the panel support and prevent the panel support from moving across a plane of the panel.

Lee teaches a display apparatus comprising 4 stops (535, only one is shown, fig. 10; also see col. 11, lines 41-46) disposed to be adjacent to four corner portions of a rear surface (100, fig. 1), and protrude from a rear surface of a bezel (500, fig. 10) to engage a panel support (400, fig. 1) and prevent the panel support from moving across a plane of a panel (300, fig. 1) (claims 6 and 15-16); wherein a hook (shown in fig. 10,

Art Unit: 2835

not labeled) is formed at a leading edge of each stop (shown in fig. 10) for engaging an edge (shown in fig. 15, not labeled) of the panel support (claims 7 and 17).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Nakamura with the display apparatus taught by Lee for holding the display apparatus properly assembled.

8. Claims 3, 10 and 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Lee et al. in view of Sasai et al. (US 6,426,803 B1).

Lee discloses the claimed invention except a tool access hole formed through the rear cover, and clearly showing a skirt of the bezel having a rabbetted edge and a skirt of the rear cover having a rabbetted edge that overlap when said bezel and said rear cover are coupled together.

Sasai teaches a tool access hole (201, fig. 4) formed through a cover (200, fig. 4), and a skirt (not numbered) of a bezel (200, fig. 6) having a rabbetted edge (at location 203, fig. 6) and a skirt of the rear cover (100, fig. 6) having a rabbetted edge (also shown at location 203, fig. 6) that overlap when said bezel and said rear cover are coupled together (shown in fig. 6).

It would have been obvious to one having ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to modify the device of Lee with the tool access hole and the skirts taught by Sasai for easily disengaging the assembly and better fitting when mating.

Allowable Subject Matter

9. Claims 8-9 and 18-19 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

10. The following is a statement of reasons for the indication of allowable subject matter: The best prior art of record, Nakamura et al. (US 5,768,095), Lee et al. (US 6,587,166 B1), and Sasai et al. (US 6,426,803 B1), taken alone or in combination, fails to teach or reasonably suggest a display apparatus comprising: a panel bearing a screen, a panel support holding the panel, a bezel framing a front peripheral of the panel, a rear cover removably mating with the bezel; and, in addition, a plurality of support ribs protruding from the rear cover so as to contact each of four stops disposed to be adjacent to four corner portions of a rear surface of the bezel to force a hook of each stop toward an edge of the panel to support the engagement of the hook and the edge of the panel as set forth in claims 8 and 18; or an edge of the panel is formed with a projection allowing a hook of each of four stops disposed to be adjacent to four corner portions of a rear surface of the bezel to overlap the projection to support the engagement of the hook and the edge of the panel as set forth in claims 9 and 19.

Response to Arguments

11. Applicant's arguments filed May 5, 2004 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. All independent claims 1 and 11 are canceled.

Conclusion

12. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

Correspondence

13. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Yean-Hsi Chang whose telephone number is (571) 272-2038. The examiner can normally be reached on 07:30-16:00.

Art Unit: 2835

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the Art Unit phone number is (571) 272-2800, ext. 35. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is (703) 305-3431 for regular communications and for After Final communications. There are RightFax numbers and provide the fax sender with an auto-reply fax verifying receipt by the USPTO: Before-Final (703-872-9318) and After-Final (703-872-9319).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 305-8558.

Yean-Hsi Chang
Patent Examiner
Art Unit: 2835
August 19, 2004

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read "Yean-Hsi Chang".